Sri S. R. KANTHI.—I have not forgotten anything. I am reading the rule itself. The rule is very clear that a motion will have to be made. If the Hon'ble Member wants, he can make a motion in particular terms.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Within the five-year period when he was the Speaker, there used to be no motion or anything of the sort. He used to place the report before the House and ask if there was any objection. Any member aggrieved used to say that the time not sufficient and that more time must be allotted and so on.

Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Please don't misinterpret. There was no such procedure that you are now talking about. I am sure there used to be a motion and on that motion some sort of a discussion took place.

Mr. SPEAKER.—A point of order has been raised. Do you want to say anything on the point of order ?

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—I leave it to the sweet will of the Chair.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—May I know the rule to which the Chief Minister just now referred ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Rule No. 228, page 61.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—Sir, the Report is before the House and the rule says that the Assembly agrees or agrees with amendments or disagrees with the report. These are the words quoted in this rule. So far as the last alternative is concerned—"disagrees with the report"—the Hon'ble Member wants to say something to request the other Members of the House to disagree with the Report that is already before the House for approval. So, no point of order is involved in this case.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palya).—I would invite the attention of the Chair to the proviso: "provided further that not more than half-an-hour shall be allotted for the discussion of the motion and no member shall speak for more than five minutes on such motion."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Muckannappa has exceeded the time-limit of five minutes and whatever be his right he has exceeded the time-limit.

In regard to the interpretation, I feel that the Hon'ble Chief Minister is right because the rule says :

> "At any time after the report has been presented to the Assembly ....."

It was done by me and the Leader of the Opposition made a motion that the Assembly agrees with it.

The next point is a motion may be moved that the Assembly agrees with amendments" Nobody has given notice of such a motion.

The third point is " or disagrees with the report". Such a motion is not before the House. Therefore, there is no point in saying that the Chief Minister is wrong in contending that there is no motion to that effect. If there is such a motion, there is a time limit also. Therefore, you have only to support. It has reached a stage that the Business Advisory Committee of the House has gone into the matter and submitted a report and it has done some work. After that, the only motion is to agree to it. There is no other motion. Sri C. J. Muckannappa should have moved an amendment that this House disagrees with the report. I can understand what has been disclosed and made known to the House and not what is happening in the Hon'ble Member's mind. I uphold the point of order raised by the Chief Minister. So, I put the question moved by the Leader of the Opposition that the House agrees with the Report placed before it.

The question is :

> "That the Assembly agrees with the Report."

The motion was adopted.

Suspension of a Member.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before the other work of the House is taken, it is my duty to refer to an incident that happened on the 3rd April 1962.

Hon'ble Members will remember that on the 3rd April 1962 which was the last day of the last series of sittings a very serious and unhappy incident took place in this House.

Since I view this incident as one of extreme gravity and seriousness and as I think it that it is necessary for the Hon'ble Members to remember all the facts correctly in order to arrive at a proper decision as to the action to be taken, I would like to recapitulate the relevant background as well as the facts relating to the incident.

On the 15th March (evening) the Governor of Mysore addressed the joint session of the Mysore State Assembly and the Mysore Legislative Council. Thereafter, the two Houses separated to do their respective work. On the 23rd March the Supplementary Demands were brought before the House and debated upon. 34 Members participated in that. Four hours and twenty-eight minutes were taken up by the Members of the Opposition of which twenty minutes were taken up by the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda. Thereafter began the presentation of the Budget by the Hon'ble Minister for Finance. The Vote on Account was taken up. Twenty-five Members participated in that. The time taken up by the Opposition was three hours and twenty-two minutes of which one hour and one minute was taken by the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda. The third topic to be taken up for debate was the Mysore Appropriation Bill. Eleven Members participated and the time taken up by the Opposition was one hour thirty minutes of which, 28 minutes were taken by the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda. The Mysore Additional Deputy Commissioners Bill to replace the ordinance was debated upon. Six Members participated. The Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda did not participate in it. Yet another Bill that was taken up was the Mysore State Forests Bill in which eight Members participated and thirty-three minutes were taken up by the Opposition out of which thirteen minutes were taken up by Sri S. Gopala Gowda. The next item to be taken up was the Motion of Thanks on Governor's Address. In this thirty Members participated. The time taken up by the Opposition was three hours and forty-eight minutes of which five minutes were taken up by the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda by way of interruptions (twice). During the course of the debate and in between, the Mysore University Amendment Bill was taken up and the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda did not participate.

The number of sittings during the sessions was eleven and the total number of hours during which the Assembly worked was forty-one hours and fifteen minutes and the time taken up by questions was one hour and forty-five minutes.

The total number of Members who participated including the Ministers for introducing the Bills, presenting the Budget and the reply to the Motion of Thanks was 149. The time taken by the Opposition was on the agg egate sixteen hours and ten minutes of which the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda took two hours and nine minutes. When the Motion of Thanks was moved and seconded, a number of amendments were given notice of. Some were given even after the time fixed for giving the amendments. By way of indulgence they were admitted and all amendments were moved one after another. The persons who proposed the amendments simply moved the amendments and did not make any speeehes at the time. This was in consonancc with the convention which had been established, *viz.*, that when there were a large number of amendments every mover of the amendments was not called upon to move the amendments separately and participate in the debate but all the amendments were moved without any speeches and the main resolution as well as the amendments were open for discussion by any Member of the House. It was in accordance with this convention that the respective Members were called upon by the Speaker to move the amendments and the entire matter was thrown open for debate. The movers of the amendments at that time did not communicate that they wanted any departure from the convention referred to above.

(MR. SPEAKER)

The Business Advisory Committee had met and had allotted two days for discussion on the Motion of Thanks. In view of the scope of the debate on (1) Supplementary Demands, (2) Budge and Vote on Account and (3) Motion of Thanks would be more or less identical and wide enough, it was mentioned at the very outset that those who participate in one may not be able to catch the Speaker's eye for participating in the others. The time during which the Assembly was to sit was extended by one day. On the day previous to the closure it was specifically mentioned by the Speaker that the time for discussion by Members would end at the time when the Assembly rises for tea-break and thereafter the Hon'ble Ministers would reply. Naturally, many Members were anxious to participate in the debate. Time limit was fixed and despite the conclusion arrived at, the Speaker was indulgent to allow the general debate to continue even after the tea-break for about an hour. When the Hon'ble Chief Minister was called upon to reply to the debate, some of the Members wanted further extensions of time for the debate from the Members before the Government could reply.

The Leader of the Opposition suggested that the House might devote the whole day for the general debate and sit for the next day. But the arrangements having been made to close the sittings at the desire of the Members and with the concurrence of all, the sitting was held in the morning beginning from 8-30 A.M. The evident desire was to close the sessions early so that all Members may return to their respective places. In fact, several Members would appear to have made arrangements to leave Bangalore. It was in this context of things the Speaker called upon the Chief Minister to reply. When the request for further time came, the Speaker desired to know as to how many Members would further like to participate. The number that stood up was so large that it would not have been possible to finish the debate even if the entire time then available was allotted to the purpose. The idea of allotting ten minutes for every Member was also taken up and found to be not feasible. It was then that the Speaker again called upon the Chief Minister to reply. At this juncture Sri S. Gopala Gowda stood up when the Chief Minister was on his legs to reply and wanted to draw the attention of the Chair and said that if the movers of the amendments are not allowed to participate in the debate it was highly irregular and that the Speaker should not do that. It was pointed out by the Speaker that what has been done was in consonance with the convention and if any of the Members or movers of amendments wanted a departure from the convention, the Speaker should have been previously appraised of it so that the time would the realigned if necessary. The explanation did not seem to have satisfied the Hon'ble Member Sri S. Gopala Gowda. He addressed the Speaker and said that if that were the situation, the Address which has occasioned the debate does not deserve any respect and therefore he would trample upon it and accordingly he put a copy of the Governor's Address on the floor and kicked it thrice and left the House. The Speaker pulled up the Member and said that it was an insult to the Governor and the words uttered by the Member would be expunged. Before any further action could be taken Sri S. Gopala Gowda left the House. Another Hon'ble Member Sri Ganji Veerappa drew the attention of the Speaker to the incident and said that it was highly objectionable and that it would amount to an insult of the House and contempt of the House and action should be taken. The Speaker suggested to the Hon'ble Member Sri Ganji Veerappa to put in writing. Accordingly, the same was put in writing. The Hon'ble Member again invited the attention of the Speaker. The Speaker replied that the matter would receive attention in due course because Sri S. Gopala Gowda had left the House and there was no scope for giving him any opportunity to withdraw or express regret or otherwise over the situation.

I am sure that Hon'ble Members will agree that the action of the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda is one of extreme seriousness and is a matter which should exercise the minde of all of us. Under the Constitution, the Governor is a part of the Legislature. The Governor's Address was delivered as required under article 176 of the Constitution. The action of the Hon'ble Member was therefore not only an insult to the Governor personally but also to the Legislature and to every one of us ; it is contempt of the highest order. It was not possible for me to consider the action to be taken on the 3rd of April itself since the Hon'ble Member left the House immediately after the incident, and I did not like to take any action without affording him an opportunity to express regret and apology.

Now that the Hon'ble Member is here and he has sufficient time to reflect on his action, I would like to know whether he has become aware of the seriousness of his action and whether he proposes to sincerely apologise and withdraw the expressions he has used on that occasion. After hearing the Member, I will take the sense of the House about the action to be taken. I must mention to the House that this is an incident which has never happened at any time anywhere and it has really caused pain to many minds and to me it has been extremely distressing that it should have happened at all, that it should have happened in this House and further it should have happened when I was in the Chair. Now, perhaps I would like to hear the Member if he wishes to say anything.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ತೀರ್ಥಹಳ್ಳಿ).— ಸನ್ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ತಾವು ಈಗ ತಾನೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕಳೆದ ತಿಂಗಳು 3ನೇ ತಾರೀಖು ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡೆದ ಘಟನೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ತಿಳಿಸಿರುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಬಹಳ ಚಿತ್ತವಿಟ್ಟು ಅದನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳೆದ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಕಾರ್ಯ ಕಲಾಪಗಳನ್ನು ಈ ಸಭೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಹೊತ್ತಿನವರೆಗೂ ನಡೆಸಿತು, ಮತ್ತು ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ವಿವರಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ನನಗೂ ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಗೂ ಬಹಳ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಉಪಕಾರವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ತಾವು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿರುವಂತೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಯಾವಾಗ ನಡೆಯಿತು, ಅದನ್ನು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ನಾವು ಚರ್ಚಿಸಿದೆವು, ಹಾಗೂ ಆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಲು ಕಾತರರಾಗಿದ್ದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಕೇವಲ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ, ಆಡಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರೂ ಇದ್ದರು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ತಾವು ತಮ್ಮ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

2-30 P.M.

ವಂದನಾನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ನಮಗೆ ದೊರೆತಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಅನೇಕರು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದ್ದೆವು. ಸಂಪ್ರದಾಯದಂತೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳಿಸಿದವರು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮರ್ಥಿಸಿ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇತ್ತು. ಕಾನೂನು ರೀತ್ಯ ಅಥವಾ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯ ವಿಧಿನಿಯಮಗಳ ರೀತ್ಯ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾಗ್ಯೂ ನಾನು ಆ ದಿನ ಸಭೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ನನಗೆ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನುವ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮುಂಚೆ ಮನಗಂಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳಿದಾಗ ಮತ್ತು ತಾವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು, ಸಭಾನಾಯಕರು ಉತ್ತರಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದಾಗ ನನಗೆ ಸ್ವಾಭಾವಿಕವಾಗಿ ದಿಗ್ಭ್ರಮೆಯುಂಟಾಯಿತು. ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆಯನ್ನು ಅಷ್ಟೊಂದು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ್ದು ನನ್ನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ ವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡೆ, ಆದುದರಿಂದಲೇ ಈ ಘಟನೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯಿಂದ, ನಾನು ಮಾಡಿದ ಕೃತಿ ಅನುಕರಣೀಯವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕೃತಿಯ ಹಿಂದೆ ಹಿನ್ನೆಲೆ ಏನು ಇದೆ, ಅದು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಪ್ರಚೋದಕವಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಾಕ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ನನಗೆ ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಭಯ ಈ ಗಾಗಲೇ ಉಂಟಾಗಿದೆ. ತಾವು " ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕೃತಿ ತೀವ್ರ ಕಟುತರವಾದುದು, ಅದರಿಂದ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರಿಗೆ ಅಗೌರವವಾಗಿದೆ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅಗೌರವವಾಗಿದೆ " ಎನ್ನುವ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ನನಗಾದರೂ ಅದು ಸರಿಯೇ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರಿಗೆ ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನನಗೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಇಲ್ಲೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬಲ್ಲೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯಸಭೆಗೆ ಅವಮಾನಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಥವಾ ಅಗೌರವ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನಂತೂ ನಾನು ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಹೊಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಕೇವಲ ನಡೆವಳಿಕೆಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯಸದಸ್ಯನ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೀ—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ ಆಗಲೀ, ಸರ್ಕಾರವೇ ಆಗಲೀ, ಯಾರೇ ಆಗಲೀ— ತುಳಿದಾಗ ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವೂ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಇವೊತ್ತು ನನ್ನ ಕೃತಿ ಮಿತಿಮೀರಿದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಭಾವಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ, ಅದು ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ವಾದಿಸುವ ಗೊಡವೆಗೆ ಹೊಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಬ್ಬನು ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡ)

ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅದು ಅವನವನ ಪ್ರವೃತ್ತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೋಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವನು ಹೇಗೆ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಾನೆ ಆ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ, ಒಂದು ತೀವ್ರ ಪ್ರಚೋದನೆ ಇದ್ದಾಗ ಒಬ್ಬ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿ ಹೇಗೆ ಅದರ ವಿರುದ್ಧ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸುತ್ತಾನೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಯಾರೂ ಇವೊತ್ತು Codify ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದೇ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟಿಸುವುದು ಸರಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕಂಡು ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ಈ ಕೃತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಏನು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡಬಹುದೋ ಅದರಂತೆ ನನಗೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮಗೆ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣವಾದ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿದೆ ಮತ್ತು ತಾವು ಆ ಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಆದರೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ನಾನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಕಳಕಳಿಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಈ ನನ್ನ ಘಟನೆಯ ನಂತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆ ಹಾಗೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಮೂಲಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ವೇನಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಅದು ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಚರಿತ್ರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯಾಗಿ ಉಳಿಯತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ, ಈ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ತಮ್ಮ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನನ್ನ ಕೃತಿಯ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಾವು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಾನು ಆಶಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾವನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದತ್ತವಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕಾರ್ಯತಃ ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಇತಿ ಮಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸಭೆ ಹೇಗೆ ನಡೆಯಬೇಕು ಸಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಆಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ, ಅದರಿಂದ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗ ಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಕಾರಣಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾವು ವಿಧಿನಿಯಮ ಗಳನ್ನು ರಚಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನಾವು ಇವೊತ್ತು ವಿಧಿನಿಯಮಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಕುಳಿತುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ, ವಿಧಿ ನಿಯಮಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಸೇರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ವಿಧಿನಿಯಮ ಗಳಿಗಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಮಾಡುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇವೊತ್ತು ಜನತಂತ್ರ ಯಶಸ್ವಿಯಾಗಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾರು ಅಲ್ಪ ಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರಿರು ತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ, ಯಾವುದೇ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ರಾಜಕೀಯ ವಾಗಿ ಆಗಲೀ, ಬೇರೆ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದಲೇ ಆಗಲೀ— ಅಂತಹವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಭೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾನ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಅಲ್ಪಸಂಖ್ಯಾತರಿಗೆ ಆ ಗೌರವ ಕೊಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಜನತಂತ್ರದ ಯಶಸ್ಸು ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಯಾರನ್ನಾ ದರೂ ಬಲಾತ್ಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಬಾಯಿಮುಚ್ಚಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯ ನಡವಳಿಕೆಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರವಲ್ಲ ಜನತೆ ಮತ್ತು ನಾವು ಈ ಜನತಂತ್ರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳಸಲ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಹುದು ಎಂಬು ನನಗೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೂ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒತ್ತಾಯದಿಂದ ಒಬ್ಬರನ್ನು ಕೂರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಭಾವ ನೆಗಳು ಉದ್ವಿಗ್ನಗೊಂಡು ಅವು ಹಿಂಸೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪರ್ಯ ವಸಾನವಾಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಅನೇಕವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಕಳಕಳಿಯಿಂದ ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ನನಗಾದರೂ ಈ ಕೃತಿ ಬಹಳ ಹೆಮ್ಮೆಯದೆಂದು ಅನಿಸಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಆ ಹೊತ್ತು ಉಂಟಾಯಿತು. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ನಾನು ವಿಷಾದಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಂಥ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಉಂಟಾಗ ಬಾರದು ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಇಂಥ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಉಂಟಾಗಬಾರದು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ.

ಈ ಸಭೆಯಿರುವುದು ಕೇವಲ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾವು ಇವೊತ್ತು ದೇಶದ ಆಗು ಹೋಗುಗಳನ್ನು ನಿರ್ಣಯಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೊರಗಡೆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳು ಏನು ಇರುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಆ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳು ಸಭೆಯ ಒಳಗೂ ಪ್ರತಿಬಿಂಬಿತವಾಗುವುದು ಸಹಜವಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರತಾಗಿ ನಾವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕುಳಿತು ಸಮಾಧಾನ ಚಿತ್ತದಿಂದ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚಿಸುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದ ರಿಂದ ಇಂಥ ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯೆಗಳು ಅನೇಕ ವೇಳೆ ಸ್ವಾಭಾ ವಿಕವಾಗಿ, ಸಹಜವಾಗಿ ಉಂಟಾಗುತ್ತವೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಯದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನು ವೈಯಕ್ತಿಕವಾಗಿ ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರಿಗೆ ಅಗೌರವ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನಿಟ್ಟು ಕೊಂಡು ರಾಜ್ಯಪಾಲರ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ನಾನುತುಳಿಯಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಗೌರವಕ್ಕೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಎಂದೂ ಹೊಂದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಭೆಯ ಘನತೆ ಗೌರವಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾಯುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಾಪಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಕಡಮೆ ಇಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆನ್ನುವ ಆಶ್ವಾಸನೆಯನ್ನ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾನ್ಯಸಭೆಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಈವಿಷಯ ದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗಾಗಲೀ ಅಥವಾ ಮಾನ್ಯಸಭೆ ಗಾಗಲೀ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಅಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯ ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಬರುವುದಾದರೆ ಅದು ನಿಜ ವಾಗಿಯೂ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಲ್ಲ, ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಅವಮಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ನನಗೆ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ನನ್ನ ಎರಡು ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As I mentioned earlier, this is a very serious matter. I deliberately did not disturb him and patiently heard all that the Hon'ble Member had to say. He seems to still feel he is right, but before I deal with that, I may mention here that on the very day, I sent for the Hon'ble Member and talked the matter over with him. I talked about it again and again. And, I find that he still seems to think that other people are wrong if they think that there has been any insult or breach of privilege or improper conduct, and he seems to think that the freedom of expression justifies his conduct. All that he means to say is that it may not be praiseworthy to hold it as a model; but still he seems to think he is right. I do not know whether the members would like to endorse the view that what

has been done is right. I for one am unable to think that there is anything anywhere that is in order what may be called right. On the other hand it is the other extreme, it is at the other end of right. This is not the first time that this question has been raised that some members feel that they have been d e n i e d some right—the right for what?—the right to speak. Everybody knows that if all the 208 members are to speak on every point, it would be impossible to carry on the work of the House. If everybody who moves an amendment insists upon the right to speak and insists that as a matter of right all must be permitted to speak, that is, 208 members perhaps barring the Ministers, if they all give amendments to every clause and every section, would it be possible to transact business? And, this regulation of debate is not happening for the first time. We are not sitting for the first time to legislate. All these years, conventions have been built on solid foundations of good procedure. To brush aside all that and say or feel that what has been done is not wrong, I for one am unable to accept. I hope and every member of the House will agree that this is not right. I wanted to give the Hon'ble Member an opportunity to express his sincere apology. He has not done so. I cannot think of any other case in which the House should pass an order of suspension in more appropriate circumstance than the present. I therefore name the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda and as required by sub-rule 2 of rule 309, I put the question:

"That the Hon'ble Member Sri Gopala Gowda be suspended from the service of the Assembly during the remainder of this session."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Member will now kindly withdraw.

(Sri S. Gopala Gowda withdrew from the House.)

MYSORE SALES-TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1962.

Motion to consider.

Sri S. R. KANTHI (Chief Minister).—Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Mysore Sales-tax (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved:

"That the Mysore Sales-tax (Amendment) Bill, 1962, be taken into consideration."

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಿತ್ರ! ನಚಿತ್ರ ಒಂದೂಅಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಯಾರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿಯೋ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ್ ಆಗಿದೆ, ಕಾನೂನು ಇದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಜಾಯಿಂಟ್ ರೆಸ್‌ಪಾನ್ಸಿಬಿಲಿಟಿ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಅವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡ ಬಹುದು. ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ ಹೆಸರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಇದು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರು ಇಂಟ್ರಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಬಿಲ್ಲು. ಅದರಮೇಲೆ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟರ ರಿಮಾರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪ್ರಿಪೇರ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಿತ್ತೆನ್ನುವುದು ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. We are landed in trouble. I am very much disturbed. ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ನಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರು ಆಗಲೇ ರಾಮು ಬರುತ್ತಾನೆ, ಶಬರಿ ಕಾದಿದ್ದಾಳೆ, ಜಾ ಗ ಬಿ ಟ್ಟು ಹೋಗಿಬಿಡುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯನದನ್ಯರು.—ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರುವವರು ನಾವಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಮಾಡದೆ ಇರುವವರು ನಾವಲ್ಲ, ನೀವು ಗಾಂಧಾರಿ ಮಕ್ಕಳು, ಶ್ರೀ ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, Minority must be respected in democracy, ನೀವು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ? ದೊಡ್ಡಗುಂಪು ನಿಮ್ಮದು ಇದೆ, ಏನುಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ, ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಹಾಗೆ ರಾಜ್ಯಭಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೀರಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಇದುಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಕಾಹಿಲೆ ಮಲಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅವರು ಕಾಹಿಲೆ ಮಲಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಮುಖ್ಯಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾತಾಡಿದರೆ ಚಿಂತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ, ಇವೊತ್ತು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು, ಆದರೆ ಈ ಕ್ರಮ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷಗಿರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪುನರಾವರ್ತನೆಯಾಗುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗ ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

†Sri S. R. KANTHI.—Sir, the Hon'ble member Sri Muckannappa is an old member. He knows the procedure quite well. Still he found it fit to raise certain objections. He does not know that sales-tax and matters connected with sales-tax have been transferred to the Finance Department,